

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/964,586	09/28/2001	Kristopher Frutschy	219.40442X00(ATSK)	2404	
7590 03/26/2004		EXAMINER			
Schwegman Lundberg Woessner & Kluth PA			PAREKH	PAREKH, NITIN	
P O Box 2938 Minneapolis, M	IN 55402		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
willing apolity, 14.			2811		
			DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004	DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary Examiner Nitin Parekh 2811 - The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address - Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Faiture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Nitin Parekh — The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address — Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims		09/964,586	FRUTSCHY ET AL.				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) □ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003. 2a) □ This action is FINAL. 2b) □ This action is non-final. 3) □ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) □ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003. 2a) □ This action is FINAL. 2b) □ This action is non-final. 3) □ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims		Nitin Parekh	2811				
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2003. 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 December 2003</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 	THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 	<u></u>	ocambar 2003					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims							
closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims	,—		At A- Ab				
ANTA Objects 4.0.44.40 and 60.70 jetus application	Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9,11-19 and 63-76</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9 and 63-76</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.							
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>28 September 2001</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).							
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received. 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78. 							
Attachment(s)		_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 15	2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal P					

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 09/964,586

Art Unit: 2811

DETAILED ACTION

Request for Continued Examination

- 1. A request for continued examination (RCE) under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/22/03 has been entered. An action on the RCE follows.
- 2. The amendment filed on 12/22/2003 has been entered.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The Information Disclosure Statement filed on 12-22-03 has been considered.

Claim Objections

- 4. Claim 74 is objected to because of the following informalities:
 - A. Claim 74 is identical to claim 64; therefore, claim 74 should be cancelled.

Appropriate correction is required.

Art Unit: 2811

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. Claims 1, 4-7, 9, 64-66, 68, 70, 74 and 75 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene, II et al. (US Pat. 6452113) in view of Dibene, II et al. (US Pat. 6452804).

Regarding claim 1, Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) disclose a power module (see 600 in Fig. 6A/6B) having integrated circuits (IC)/an IC package comprising:

- a substrate (702 of an assembly 700 in Fig. 9 and 7) supporting the
 microprocessor/IC die (310 in Fig. 7; Col. 8, line 66) on the IC die of the substrate
- the power module comprising a packaged circuit board (PCB)/package frame (602 in Fig. 6A/6B and 9) mounted/attached at a peripheral area and above a perimeter of the substrate (see Fig. 9 and Fig. 7; Col. 4, lines 25-28; Col. 8, lines 60-68; Col. 9, line 25) and arranged apart from the IC die on the substrate, and
- the power module providing a low impedance, low inductance power/current path to the die through the circuit components and electrical connectors (see 608A/608B and 612A/612B respectively in Fig. 6A/6B); and being functional as a power/ground impedance deliverer (PGID) to provide power/ground impedance delivery path/circuit (Col. 7, line 53- Col. 9, line 37)

(Fig. 6A-12; Col. 7, line 50- Col 10, line 25).

Art Unit: 2811

Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) further teach the electrical connections/structure providing dual functions including a mechanical and electrical functions where the mechanical function includes the conductive interconnects providing a coupling/rigidity/support for the substrate (Col. 8, lines 50-60) and mechanical fasteners (802 in Fig. 9) proving the predetermined level of mechanical fastening/stiffening (Col. 9, lines 32-37).

Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) further teach a variety of module assembly configurations including an embodiment where the package frame (see 2204 in Fig. 22) is positioned/mounted/attached at a peripheral/corner area including a perimeter of the substrate and extends along the perimeter and two side edges of the substrate (see 2204 and 2202 in Fig. 22; Fig. 22-25; Col. 14, line 16- Col. 15, line 22).

Dibene II, et al. ('113 patent) fail to teach the PCB/package frame being a package stiffener concurrently providing a stiffening support.

Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) further teach in another embodiment of Fig. 26, the PCB/package frame serving as a stiffener board for the assembly (Col. 15, lines 23-30).

Dibene, II et al. ('804 patent) teach an integrated circuit (IC) package having an interposer substrate (104 in Fig. 1) supporting the microprocessor/IC die (101 in Fig. 1) where a power regulator board/electrical conductor assembly (102/103 in Fig. 1) delivering a low inductance current, providing mechanical/fastening support to the

Art Unit: 2811

interposer substrate (Col. 5, line 25; Col. 5, line 55) and also being functional as a stiffener board (Col. 6, lines 28-33) when assembled with an electrically conductive frame and associated fittings to provide a three-dimensional Integrated architecture/configuration (Col. 5, line 53- Col. 7, line 25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the PCB/package frame being the package stiffener concurrently providing a stiffening support as taught by the embodiment of Fig. 26 in Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) and Dibene, II et al. ('804 patent) so that the mechanical coupling and the component support can be improved in Dibene, II et al's ('113 patent) package.

Regarding claims 4-6, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire structure as applied to claim 1 above, wherein Dibene II et al. ('113 patent) teach the substrate being a core substrate having a multiple internal layers in the IC- printed circuit board (IC-PCB) carrier package, the package having a variety of configurations including the flip chip ball grid/array device, built-up multiplayer (BML), pinned grid array- PGA and ceramic land grid array (CLGA), etc. (Col. 9, lines 10-30; Col. 7, lines 25-43).

Art Unit: 2811

Regarding claim 7, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claim 1 above, wherein Dibene II et al. ('113 patent) further teach the PCB/package frame being made of an electrically conductive surfaces/sections using conventional circuit board fabrication processing including etching and metallization (Col. 8, lines 24-37) to withstand conditions/temperature of normal IC operation (Col. 3, 4 and 7-16), but Dibene II et al. ('113 and 804 patents) fail to teach using the frame being made of one of a stamped, etched, extruded and deposited frame.

Regarding claim 7, Making or depositing the frame do not distinguish over Dibene II et al. ('113 and '804 patents) regardless of the process for forming the frame, because only the final product is relevant, not the process of making such as "molding/stamping/etching, etc. or laminating ". Note that a "product by process" claim is directed to the product per se, no matter how actually made, In re Hirao, 190 USPQ 15 at 17 (footnote 3). See also In re Brown, 173 USPQ 685; In re Luck, 177 USPQ 523; In re Fessmann, 180 USPQ 324; In re Avery, 186 USPQ 161; In re Wertheim, 191 USPQ 90 (209 USPQ 554 does not deal with this issue); and In re Marrosi et al., 218 USPQ 289, all of which make it clear that it is the patentability and not the patentability of the process, and that an old or obvious

Art Unit: 2811

product produced by a new method is not patentable as a product, whether claimed in "product by process" claims or not. Note that applicant has the burden of proof in such cases, as the above case law makes clear. See also MPEP 706.03(e).

Regarding claim 9, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claim 1 above, wherein Dibene II et al. ('113 patent) further teach a heat sink/heat spreader plate assembly (1006/1010/1004 in Fig. 10-11B) being bonded to/supported on the PCB/package frame (Col. 9, line 40-67).

Regarding claims 63, 65 and 68, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claim 1 above, wherein Dibene II et al. ('113 patent) teach the package frame being configured to be functional as the PGID for the module and being in a form of a ring having a central aperture (604 in Fig. 6A/6B; Col. 8, line 26).

Regarding claims 64, 74 and 75, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claim 63 above, wherein Dibene II et al. ('113 patent) further teach a heat sink/heat spreader plate/assembly (1006/1010/1004 in Fig. 10-11B) being integrally bonded to/coupled/supported on the package frame/PGID (Col. 9, line 40-67) such that the package frame/PGID and the IC

Art Unit: 2811

die are in between the spreader plate and the substrate (see 602, 1006/1004, 302 and 702 respectively in Fig. 6A-11B).

Regarding claim 66, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claim 63 above, wherein Dibene II et al. ('113 patent) further teach another embodiment (Fig. 14) where the package frame/PGID comprises two separate components/sections (see 1402 and 1404 in Fig. 14) being positioned on the respective section of the substrate (Col. 10, lines 35- Col. 11), the corner edges of the sections having rounded corners.

Regarding claim 70, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claim 63 above, wherein Dibene II et al. ('113 patent) teach the package frame/PGID and the substrate being made of conventional circuit board material comprising insulating material/portions and metallized components/circuit layers (Col. 8, line 6; Col. 9, line 10), the package frame/PGID and the substrate having similar thermal properties such as coefficient of thermal expansion (CTE).

Regarding claim 74, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claim 63 above,

Art Unit: 2811

6. Claims 2, 3, 67, 69 and 71-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene, II et al. ('113 and '804 patents) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Dehaine et al. (US Pat. 5925925).

Regarding claim 2, Dibene, II et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claim 1 above, except the stiffener including a copper (Cu) ring split into power and ground portions having an insulating couplers electrically isolating the power and ground portions of the Cu ring.

Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) further teach the PCB/package frame comprising:

- plated through-holes and electrically conductive surfaces/pads (610, 616A/B respectively in Fig. 6A/B; Col. 8, lines 25-50) being electrically connected to a conductive interconnect spacer having electrically conductive portions
 (612A/612B in Fig. 6A), the conductive layer/plating being copper (Cu)
- the conductive interconnect spacer providing dual functions including a mechanical support/coupling with the substrate and two separate conductive paths 616A and 616B in Fig. 6A/6B) including a first power path and a second ground path respectively in a coaxial arrangement (Col. 8, lines 50-68), and
- the electrically conductive portions of the conductive interconnect spacer being separated by an insulating dielectric portion/section (612 C in Fig. 6A; Col. 8, lines 37-47).

Art Unit: 2811

Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) further teach in another embodiments of Fig. 13 and 14, a configuration of the power and ground conductive paths being provided in two concentric metal rings electrically isolated from each other (see 1306/1304 and 1404/1402 respectively in Fig. 13 and 14; Col. 10, lines 35- Col. 11, line 15) or using a plurality of two piece coaxial conductive interconnects at the corners of the IC die (Col. 9, lines 1-4).

Dehaine et al. teach a BGA package comprising a frame and a heat dissipating support plate (13 and 17 respectively in Fig. 1 and 3A/3C) where the frame is divided/split into four rings/sections of conductive planes (Q1-Q4 in Fig. 3A/3C) such that each ring/section is separated from each other by an insulating strip (23 in Fig. 3A/3C; Col. 10, line 57) and each ring/section can be electrically connected to different signal potentials/functions such as ground, desired voltage, etc. (see a ground ring 24 in Fig. 3A; Col. 11, line 9) in order to achieve the desired signal transmission and power decoupling functions (Col. 10, line 52- Col. 11, line 18).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the stiffener including a copper (Cu) ring split into power and ground portions having an insulating couplers electrically isolating the power and ground portions of the Cu as taught by the embodiments of Fig. 13 and 14 in Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) and Dehaine et al. so that the

Art Unit: 2811

desired ground/voltage routing and mechanical coupling can be achieved and the signal noise/interference can be reduced in Dibene, II et al's ('113 and '804 patents) package.

Regarding claim 3, Dibene, II et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, wherein Dibene, II et al. further teach the conductive surfaces/paths being bonded/mounted on the substrate via conventional solder bonding to provide a low resistance/high current path and to remove heat from the substrate (Col. 10, lines 20-26; Col. 11, lines 9-15).

Regarding claims 67 and 69, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claims 63 and 68 above, except the PGID being positioned at separate corner edges of the substrate or having rounded corners respectively.

Dibene II et al. ('113 patent) further teach another embodiment (Fig. 14) where the package frame/PGID comprises two separate components/sections including corner edges (see 1402 and 1404 in Fig. 14) being positioned on the respective section of the substrate (Col. 10, lines 35- Col. 11), the corner edges having rounded corners.

Dehaine et al. teach the BGA package comprising a frame and a heat dissipating support plate (13 and 17 respectively in Fig. 1 and 3A/3C) where the frame is

Art Unit: 2811

divided/split into four rings/sections of conductive planes (Q1-Q4 in Fig. 3A/3C) such that each ring/section being positioned at separate corner edges of a substrate.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the PGID being positioned at separate corner edges of the substrate or having rounded corners as taught by the embodiments of Fig. 13 and 14 in Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) and Dehaine et al. so that the desired ground/voltage routing and mechanical coupling can be achieved and the signal noise/interference can be reduced in Dibene, II et al's ('113 and '804 patents) package.

Regarding claims 71-73, Dibene, II et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to claim 63 above, except the PGID having a ground side and power side portions and having insulating couplers separating the power and ground portions and providing an aid in the structural integrity of the PGID.

Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) further teach the package frame/PGID comprising:

plated through-holes and electrically conductive surfaces/pads (610, 616A/B respectively in Fig. 6A/B; Col. 8, lines 25-50) being electrically connected to a conductive interconnect spacer having electrically conductive portions
 (612A/612B in Fig. 6A), the conductive layer/plating being copper (Cu)

Art Unit: 2811

- the conductive interconnect spacer providing dual functions including a mechanical support/coupling with the substrate and two separate conductive paths 616A and 616B in Fig. 6A/6B) including a first power path and a second ground path respectively in a coaxial arrangement (Col. 8, lines 50-68), and

 the electrically conductive portions of the conductive interconnect spacer being separated by an insulating dielectric portion/coupling section (612 C in Fig. 6A;
 Col. 8, lines 37-47).

Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) further teach in another embodiments of Fig. 13 and 14, the PGID configuration comprising power and ground conductive paths being provided in two concentric metal rings electrically isolated from each other (see 1306/1304 and 1404/1402 respectively in Fig. 13 and 14; Col. 10, lines 35- Col. 11, line 15) and being bonded/soldered to provide an integral structure.

Dehaine et al. teach a BGA package comprising a frame and a heat dissipating support plate (13 and 17 respectively in Fig. 1 and 3A/3C) where the frame is divided/split into four rings/sections of conductive planes (Q1-Q4 in Fig. 3A/3C) such that each ring/section is separated from each other by an insulating strip/coupling section (23 in Fig. 3A/3C; Col. 10, line 57), such configuration providing a structural integrity for the frame. Furthermore, each ring/section can be electrically connected to different signal potentials/functions such as ground, desired voltage, etc. (see a ground ring 24 in Fig. 3A; Col. 11, line 9) in order to achieve the desired signal transmission and power decoupling functions (Col. 10, line 52- Col. 11, line 18).

Art Unit: 2811

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the PGID having a ground side and power side portions and having insulating couplers separating the power and ground portions and providing an aid in the structural integrity of the PGID as taught by the embodiments of Fig. 13 and 14 in Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) and Dehaine et al. so that the desired ground/voltage routing and mechanical coupling can be achieved and the signal noise/interference can be reduced in Dibene, II et al's ('113 and '804 patents) package.

7. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene, II et al. ('113 and 804 patents) as applied to claims 1 and 2 above, and further in view of Dehaine et al. (US Pat. 5925925) and Banks et al. (US Pat. 6015722).

Regarding claim 8, Dibene II et al. ('113 and 804 patents) and Dehaine et al. teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claims 1 and 2 above, except using a thermal interface material and an epoxy to bond the heat spreader plate to the split copper ring and the die respectively.

Dibene II et al. ('113 patents) further teach a heat sink/heat spreader plate assembly (1006/1010/1004 in Fig. 10-11B) being bonded to the PCB/package frame and the IC die using a thermal interface material such as a thermal grease (Col. 9, line 40-67).

Art Unit: 2811

Banks et al. teach a heat dissipative flip chip package where a lid/heat spreader plate is bonded to a copper ring/stiffener (532 and 522 in Fig. 9) using a conventional adhesive material such as an epoxy (538 in Fig. 9; Col. 28, line 2) to provide the desired adhesion and moisture protection (Col. 26, line 30- Col. 28, line 28).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the thermal interface material and the epoxy to bond the heat spreader plate to the split copper ring and the die respectively as taught by Banks et al. so that the adhesion and moisture protection can be improved in Dehaine et al. and Dibene, II et al's ('113 and 804 patents) package.

8. Claim 76 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dibene, II et al. ('113 and 804 patents) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Belady (US Pat. 6285550).

Regarding claim 76, Dibene II, et al. ('113 and '804 patents) teach substantially the entire claimed structure as applied to the claim 1 above, except a power pod supplying the power to the IC die.

Belady teaches a power module having a variety of electrical components including a substrate, microprocessor/die, heat sink, etc. where power supply is arranged through a conventional power pod (Col. 9, lines 17-23; Col. 8-10).

Art Unit: 2811

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to incorporate the power pod supplying the power to the IC die as taught by Belady so that the desired flexibility in power supply arrangement can be achieved in Dehaine et al. and Dibene, II et al's ('113 and 804 patents) package.

Response to Arguments

- Applicant's arguments filed on 12-22-03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- A. Applicant contends that there is no suggestion to combine Dibene, II et al. patents ('113 and 804 patents) and Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) does not teach the

stiffener being mounted at the perimeter of the substrate and concurrently providing the stiffening support .

However, as explained above, Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) teach the package frame structure providing dual functions including mechanical and electrical functions where the mechanical functions includes the conductive interconnects providing a coupling/rigidity/support for the substrate (Col. 8, lines 50-60) and mechanical fasteners (802 in Fig. 9) proving the predetermined level of mechanical fastening/stiffening (Col. 9, lines 32-37), the package frame being mounted/attached with different configurations including at or above the perimeter of the substrate (see Fig. 7-9, 22, etc.). Dibene, II et

Art Unit: 2811

al. ('113 patent) further teach in another embodiment of Fig. 26, the PCB/package frame serving as a stiffener board for the assembly (Col. 15, lines 23-30).

Dibene, II et al. ('804 patent) teach a power module frame/board assembly (102/103 in Fig. 1) being mounted on the substrate where the frame being electrically conductive, being coupled to the board with associated fittings and frame/board assembly is functional as a stiffener providing mechanical, thermal and electrical functions (Col. 6, lines 28-33; Col. 5, line 53- Col. 7, line 25). Therefore, the combination of Dibene, II et al. patents ('113 and 804 patents) and Dibene, II et al. ('113 patent) is applied for a prime facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nitin Parekh whose telephone number is 571-272-1663. The examiner can normally be reached on 09:00AM-05:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eddie Lee can be reached on 571-272-1732. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9318.

Art Unit: 2811

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0956.

NP

03-15-04

NITIN PAREKH

PATENT EXAMINER

Nitri Parekh

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800